

André E. Jardini, Bar No. 71335  
 aej@kpclegal.com  
 K.L. Myles, Bar No. 243272  
 klm@kpclegal.com  
 KNAPP, PETERSEN & CLARKE  
 550 North Brand Boulevard, Suite 1500  
 Glendale, California 91203-1922  
 Telephone: (818) 547-5000  
 Facsimile: (818) 547-5329

Joseph S. Farzam, Bar No. 210817  
 farzam@lawyer.com  
 JOSEPH FARZAM LAW FIRM  
 1875 Century Park East, Suite 1345  
 Los Angeles, California 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 226-6890  
 Facsimile: (310) 226-6891

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant  
 PI-NET INTERNATIONAL, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

FOCUS BUSINESS BANK,

Defendant.

PI-NET INTERNATIONAL, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BRIDGE BANK, N.A.,

Defendant.

NOS. 5:12-cv-04958 PSG; 5:12- cv-  
 04959 PSG

Date: January 27, 2015  
 Time: 10:00 a.m.  
 Ctrm: 5

Judge: The Hon. Paul S. Grewal  
 Date Action Filed: September 24, 2012

PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO  
 DEFENDANTS FOCUS BUSINESS  
 BANK, AND BRIDGE BANK,  
 N.A.'S MOTION TO DISMISS  
 CASES

KNAPP,  
 PETERSEN  
 & CLARKE

1 Plaintiff, Pi-Net International, Inc. (“plaintiff”) opposes the motion to dismiss  
 2 filed on behalf of defendants Focus Business Bank and Bridge Bank, N.A.

3 **I.**

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 These matters were ordered stayed on August 16, 2013, in a conditional order  
 6 of the Court. On October 17, 2013, based in part on “defendants’ consent” the Court  
 7 stayed the case pending resolution of the inter partes review proceedings. The Court  
 8 has not lifted the stay in this matter.

9 The inter partes review has not concluded. Plaintiff continues to litigate the  
 10 inter partes review. Plaintiff has until January 24, 2015, to file an appeal with the  
 11 Federal Circuit from the various decisions by the patent office as to the patents-in-  
 12 suit.

13 A lift of the stay, which stay was requested by defendants in the first instance,  
 14 is unwarranted under the circumstances.

15 **II.**

16 **THE MOTION TO DISMISS, IF CONSIDERED, IS ILL-FOUNDED**

17 The patent assignments dated August 28, 2014, expressly assign the right to  
 18 sue for past infringement.

19 This provision is valid and enforceable.

20 Defendants recognize that the assignment agreements grant Dr. Arunachalam  
 21 the right to maintain suit in her own name and under Pi-Net’s corporate identity.  
 22 Parties have the freedom to contract and there is no prohibition to such agreement.  
 23 Each has an interest in the litigation.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

KNAPP,  
PETERSEN  
& CLARKE

**III.**  
**CONCLUSION**

The stay should not be lifted. The motion to dismiss should be denied.

Dated: January 6, 2015

KNAPP, PETERSEN & CLARKE

By: /s/ André E. Jardini

André E. Jardini

K.L. Myles

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-  
Defendant PI-NET  
INTERNATIONAL, INC.

KNAPP,  
PETERSEN  
& CLARKE